DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 132 708 EA 008 999

AUTHOR Terborg, James R.
TITLE Integration of Women into Management Positions: A Research Review.
PUB DATE Sep 76
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association (84th, Washington, D.C., September 3-7, 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Career Choice; *Employment Opportunities; Employment Practices; *Females; *Literature Reviews; *Management; Managerial Occupations; Role Conflict; Sex Role; Sex Stereotypes; Socialization; Social Science Research

ABSTRACT

This paper reviews the literature on the psychological and social processes involved in the integration of women into management positions. The author concentrates on two areas. First is the entry of women into management (including women's career choices, choice of organization, and the effects of these choices on the organization. These effects include the impact on recruitment procedures and male job applicants). The second area concerns the socialization and development of women managers once they have gained entry. The research in this area deals with the personal needs, values, and skills of women managers, as well as with the physical-technological environment and the social-interpersonal environment that women managers must face. The author suggests that researchers should conduct more longitudinal field research and should investigate the effects of women in management on the society as a whole. (Author/DS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED132708

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Integration of Women into Management Positions:

A Research Review

Presented at the 84th Annual Convention of the

American Psychological Association,

Washington, D.C., September, 1976

James R. Terborg

Department of Psychology

University of Illinois

Champaign, Ill. 61820

EA 008 999

Integration of Women into Management Positions:

A Research Review

The purpose of this paper is to review the literature on the psychological processes surrounding the integration of women into management. The background research for this paper was limited to articles published in the past few years that had implications for a psychological analysis of the area. Reviews of research published prior to 1973 can be found in Gordon and Strober (1975), O'Leary (1974), and to some extent Terborg and Ilgen (1975).

To provide some semblance of order to the wide variety of studies, topics, etc., that were encountered in the review, I have chosen to consider two broad issues. The first concerns the entry of women into management; the second concerns the socialization and development of women once they have gained entry.

Entry

The entry of women into management positions can be examined from several perspectives. These include: (1) choice of a career or occupation, (2) choice of a particular organization within which to work, and (3) the effects of these choices on other variables in the system such as male job applicants and recruitment practices of the organization.

Theory and research on career choice points to the importance of a person's self-concept as a determiner of vocational preferences. Other things being equal, people will choose careers which are consistent with their beliefs about themselves (Korman, 1970; Super, 1953). In the past, women have been denied the opportunity to gain entry into management jobs. Also, the existence of a "male managerial model" perpetuates societal norms that women should not

or can not be successful in management. Thus, we find that women as a group have a self-image which is not consistent with that assumed necessary for management. As reported by McClelland (1965) and others (cf., Jacklin & Maccoby, 1975; O'Leary, 1974), women as a group describe themselves as different from or even opposite to men as a group on presumed requisite management traits. Schein (1973, 1975) has shown that these beliefs are strongly held by male managers and female managers as well.

One area for research then may be the examination of the self-concepts of women who do choose careers in management. Why do some women develop self-concepts consistent with management careers?

Evidence exists which suggests that women choosing "male" careers were raised in families where the mother worked full-time and where sex-typed behaviors were <u>not</u> emphasized (Almquist, 1974; Vogel, Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, & Rosenkrantz, 1970). It would appear that to the extent women and men develop a gender free self-concept that more women will choose careers in business and management. The increase of women in business courses, MBA programs, and even little league holds promise of a changing self-concept at least among some women. As an added benefit, we would expect to find an increase in the number of males entering traditionally female occupations with occupational sex-typing becoming less pervasive.

Perhaps of more immediate concern, however, might be the effects of blocked career pathways. Just because some women develop self-images consistent with management jobs does not guarantee their entry into these jobs. Schein (1971) noted that she was advised to contact Dr. Joyce Brothers rather than consider a job with that organization as an industrial psychologist. In a more serious vein, Weisman, Morlock, Sack, and Levine (1976) found that

counseling given to females who were denied entry into medical school was different from that given to males who were denied entry into medical school. Men were encouraged to re-apply to more schools or to consider a Ph.D. program in a related field. Women were warned of the difficulties that would lie ahead if they chose to persist in medicine and were encouraged to change their career aspirations. The consequences of these practices, if continued, might be to lower the self-concepts of the affected women, and to perpetuate sex-typed occupations. Of interest, however, were their findings that women who reported themselves as in agreement with the women's rights movement showed a degree of persistence in having a medical career similar to that of males. Clearly more research should be directed toward the causes, occurrences, and consequences of such career counseling for both females applying for masculine jobs and males applying for feminine jobs.

This raises a point I intend to emphasize throughout this paper. We should not limit our research attention only to women and to attitudes men have about women. Rather, given an open system with feedback loops and interdependencies, it might be valuable to consider whether the career aspirations and job choices of women have any effect on the career aspirations and job choices of men. For example, Touhey (1974a, b) reported that the increase of women into previously male dominated occupations resulted in a decrease in the rated prestige and desirability of those occupations, while the increase of males into female occupations resulted in an increase in the rated prestige and desirability of those occupations. The integration of women into masculine jobs then may influence the available labor pool of men who choose to enter that occupation. Does the admittance of women into West Point affect the choice of men to attend West Point, and if so, what are the consequences of

this self-selection for all job applicants and the organization?

Given that a woman has chosen a career in management, the next step is to gain entry into an organization of her choice. Important factors here include evaluation of the organization by the woman applicant and evaluation of the woman applicant by the organization. Most of the research seems to address the latter.

On the positive side, evidence indicates that predictors such as biographical data and assessment center ratings, which have been validated on males, also predict managerial performance for females (Huck & Bray, 1976; Moses & Boehm, 1975; Nevo, 1976). There is, however, some question as to the comparability of criterion ratings across sexes (Nevo, 1976). This is especially relevant for subjective ratings as will be addressed later. But generally speaking, the inability to predict female performance does not appear to be a barrier to the entry of women into management.

On the other hand, we have somewhat of a contradiction in that several studies have shown that women are perceived to be lacking in requisite managerial traits and to be limited in potential to perform various behaviors. The existence of these stereotypes are frequently invoked as explanations for the findings that women are rated less desirable for management positions than men (cf., Bowman, Worthy, & Greyson, 1965; Cecil, Paul, & Olins, 1973; Cohen & Bunker, 1975; Dipboye, Fromkin, & Wiback, 1975; Rosen & Jerdee, 1974; Schein, 1973, 1975; Terborg & Ilgen, 1975).

While not questioning these findings, there are two alternative explanations other than that women are perceived to be limited in required traits/behaviors. The first concerns the manner in which stereotypes are measured. In some studies, respondents are asked to describe the "typical female" or

the "typical manager," etc. In other studies, respondents may only be told that the applicant is a woman for a white collar job. As stated by O'Leary (1974) and others (cf., Brigham, 1971), the use of different instructional sets to elicit stereotypic profiles or evaluative responses may produce different results. For example, Brigham (1971) in discussing the measurement of ethnic stereotypes stated that asking about the "typical black" and the "typical white" confounds race with socio-economic status. When these are varied systematically, socio-economic status accounts for more response variance than race. Similarly, asking about the "typical woman" and the "typical manager" confounds sex with occupation since most managers are males. Consider the different profiles that might be provided to the instructional set of "typical woman" and "typical woman MBA." The "typical woman MBA" may elicit the same profile as the "typical male MBA." Therefore, while women as a group may for a variety of reasons be perceived as displaying various traits with less frequency than men as a group, this does not mean that the subset of women who have demonstrated management career aspirations are seen as being deficient in these requisite management characteristics.

As a final comment on the issue of sex-stereotypes and discrimination, several writers in the field of attitudes and behaviors state that general group stereotypes are probably not related to the beliefs about particular members of that group just as general attitude measures do not predict specific attitudes or behaviors toward any particular object (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1973; Brigham, 1971; Feldman & Hilterman, 1975). Rather, for stereotypes to be useful, we need to determine the intra-personal and situational conditions under which clearly delineated attitudes do and do not relate to behavior toward individual group members (Terborg, Peters, Ilgen, & Smith, in press).

For example, Rosen and Jerdee (1974) reported that stereotypes appear to have little impact on personnel decisions when specific rules are operative. Similarly, Terborg and Ilgen (1975) found that attitudes toward women as managers were related to subsequent behaviors only in situations where little information about the female was provided.

A second explanation for the findings that women are rated as less desirable for management positions involves not the belief that women lack the abilities and traits necessary for success, but rather the fear that other members in the organization will not accept women in positions of authority. Bowman et. al. (1965) found that even when women were perceived as capable, they were not judged as desirable for management because of the anticipation of resistance by co-workers. Consider the possibility of an American woman petroleum engineer supervising the work of Arab males in the Middle East. Consider further, if you will, the ramifications if this woman were Jewish. The point is that future research must be designed to determine the reasons why women are rated less desirable for management rather than simply demonstrating the occurrence. Such research would allow for affirmative action programs to be designed with greater direction and focus.

Earlier it was stated that research on the entry of women into management positions also requires that factors associated with the woman's evaluation of the organization be studied. This is important for at least two reasons. First, Terborg and Ilgen (1975) suggested that one subtle but effective means of denying women entry into an organization would be to offer lower salaries to women applicants. The intention being to let the applicant choose not to accept the job offer. In this instance the organization appears to comply with EEOC guidelines concerning minority employees since an offer was extended.

In reality, though, this form of discrimination would rarely occur given the aggressive prosecution record of the EEOC. However, it has been suggested by economists and others (cf., Rosen & Jerdee, 1975; Treiman & Terrell, 1975) that lower salaries offered to women are justified for economic reasons and do not represent discrimination. The logic is that women as a group are less likely to provide a return on the company's recruitment and training costs since women terminate employment sooner than men. Simply stated, women are worth less from a cost/benefit standpoint.

The fallacy with this argument is twofold. First, studies have found that women do not take more sick leave, terminate sooner, etc. (Bast, 1972). Second, even if they did, the reason for this behavior may reside in the lower salaries women are paid. If women perceive their rewards as inequitable, then they should be less likely to remain with the organization. Similar findings have been reported for men (Dansereau, Cashman, & Graen, 1973; Lawler, 1971). Thus, while women may display the behaviors which seem to justify their lower salaries, they are in fact victims of unfair employment practices. Although women still lag behind men in salaries (Treiman & Terrell, 1975), recent statistics compiled by the College Placement Council on 1976 college graduates show that in technological fields women are being offered higher salaries than men. It would now be interesting to see if male applicants display the same behaviors of high turnover, etc., which led economists to state that women were worth less when considering potential returns on investments.

Turning to factors other than salary, the reviewed literature contained no studies which examined the processes associated with a woman's job choice. While some research has been done with male MBA's (cf., Lawler, Kuleck, Rhode,

& Sorensen, 1975), little is known about such factors as (1) number of women in management, (2) past utilization of women by that organization, and so forth. Research needs to be done which specifies how women choose a company. This may be critical if such things as the availability of female role models has an effect on the socialization and development of women managers.

Finally, recent statistics (College Placement Council) show that job offers to women with college degrees are increasing at a faster rate than offers to men with college degrees. Increasing numbers of women applicants coupled with a lack of managerial talent and legal pressures requiring the integration of women into all levels of the organization suggest that gaining entry into management is not the barrier that it was a few years ago. Rather, the problem is to assure that the new woman manager will be given the opportunity to make a contribution to the organization and to develop her own skills and abilities.

Socialization and Development

Regardless of whether a woman is hired from outside the organization or promoted from within, she faces a new environment and must learn how to behave effectively in that environment. New employees of either sex must be properly socialized if they are to fit in with the established functioning of the existing work unit.

Important factors in this socialization process are (1) the person system of the new employee, (2) the physical-technological environment associated with the job, and (3) the social-interpersonal environment of the work unit (cf., Graen, 1976; McGrath, 1976). The person system refers to the needs, values, expectations, self-image, skills, etc., that the new manager brings with her to the job. The physical-technological environment includes the

skill/behavioral demands of the job or task to be performed. The social-interpersonal environment refers to the expectations that relevant others (peers, superiors, subordinates) have concerning the new manager's behavior, temperament, and work patterns.

Effective socialization is achieved when the new employee learns what is expected of her from the task environment and the interpersonal environment, and then can behave effectively in this role in a manner consistent with her own person system. Actions discrepant from expectations may elicit additional pressures to conform, may alter the content of the sent expectations, or some combination of both. As pointed out by Graen (1976) it is important to distinguish between role-taking and role-making. The former involves the reception and compliance of the sent role from one's role set. The latter takes into account the ability of the role incumbent to bring about changes in the expected behavior pattern held by the role set.

The development of the new employee into a contributing member of the organization is a by-product of a successful socialization process. This comes about through the attainment of meaningful goals by independent effort and utilization of one's skills and abilities (Hall, 1971). The employee is provided with opportunities to achieve and to master new skills. This fosters a positive self-image and tracks the employee into a cycle of goal attainment.

Malfunctions in this socialization process can arise from several sources and would become manifest as dysfunctional behaviors, lack of skill utilization, lowered self-image, and perhaps termination of employment or promotion into dead-end jobs. To the extent that opportunities are denied, expectations and behaviors from one source are in conflict with expectations and behaviors from another source, or skill and training are deficient; the new employee will encounter resistance. This places stress not only on the

effected new employee, but on other components in the larger system as well (cf., Alderfer, 1971).

Given this conceptualization of employee socialization and development, and the importance of the interchange among the person system, the technological environment, and the interpersonal environment, we can better evaluate existing research on the integration of women into management. The following discussion will consider each of these systems/environments as unique and interactive sources of influence on the socialization and development process.

First, past research has not sufficiently examined the influence of the technological environment on the socialization of women managers. Just as co-workers communicate their expectations concerning appropriate behaviors to the new employee, the technological requirements of the job also may be thought to communicate expectations of appropriate skills, abilities, and behaviors. The new manager must possess the technical expertise required of her job. Problems arise when women are placed on jobs for which they have no technical knowledge and experience, and are denied opportunities to acquire this needed expertise.

In theory, such mis-matches should rarely occur if accepted methods and techniques of personnel selection and placement are followed. However, many organizations are faced with the problem of integrating women into management at all levels in the organization. The present lack of experienced women managers forces organizations to instigate "crash" programs of management development. Unfortunately, these programs are often nothing more than placing a reasonably bright woman into management, regardless of her experience or training. Consider the consequences of this statement: "Yesterday she didn't even know how to spell merchandise and today she is my merchandising manager."

Such token placement of unqualified women will have effects on the woman's own person system and on other components in the larger system. Resentment by more tenured and qualified males, witholding of technical and emotional support, even direct attempts to assure her failure may result. The young MBA who is immediately placed in a position of authority over older more experienced workers faces a "show me what you can do" attitude from these passed over subordinates. In the case of a woman, the need to demonstrate that she is capable may be even more significant. Her high visibility will most likely magnify any mistake she makes. The list could continue, but the point is that almost no research to date has focused on the consequences to the woman and her colleagues of a mis-match between the woman's skills, abilities, and experience and the requirements of the job in which she is placed.

The woman manager's own person system represents a second important factor with regard to her socialization and development. To the extent that women have different values, motivations, self-images, and so forth than men, they may experience different pressures during the socialization process.

A search of the literature showed that considerable research attention has been directed toward this general area.

First, although it was stated earlier that some studies show differences between men and women on measures of values, self-image, etc., when women managers are studied they generally appear to be very similar to male managers. Miner (1974) found that within a sample of store managers and school administrators there were no differences between sexes on motivation to manage. Further, managerial motivation was related as would be expected to managerial performance for females. Similar findings were reported by Morrison and Sebald (1974). Female executives were similar to male executives on self-esteem,

motivation, and mental ability. Also, when male executives were compared with male nonexecutives and female executives were compared with female nonexecutives, similar profile patterns emerged. Bartol (1976) examined job orientation (i.e., values the individual places on job rewards and outcomes) as a function of occupational grouping and sex. Same occupational groups showed more similarity than same sex groups. Finally, Miner (1965) reported that the managerial motivation of women changed with training and experience in a manner similar to that observed with men. These results coupled with the relationship between self-concept and occupational choice suggest that women who gain entry into management jobs and experience the pressures associated with that job have similar person systems to men who encounter equivalent experiences.

Just as these studies indicate that women do possess or can develop person systems compatible with management jobs, other evidence shows that this match is not attained without some costs. Hawley (1971) found that role expectations and role behaviors of women were strongly related to these women's perceptions of the male stereotype of women. To the extent that these attitudes place home and family responsibilities primarily in the domain of the "feminine role," then the working woman will experience pressures from relevant others, and perhaps her own self-concept, to sacrifice her professional career for family responsibilities. Mathews, Collins, and Cobb (1974) found that such responsibilities were frequently mentioned as reasons why women terminated training for the job of air traffic controller while men who terminated rarely mentioned this as a reason. Consistent results with role conflict as the dependent variable were reported by Gordon and Hall (1974) and Hall and Gordon (1973).

It appears then that while women can add the role of a business career, they have difficulty shedding the role of housewife and mother. This results in experienced role conflict on two levels. First, conflicts can arise due to the incompatibility between the woman's self-perception of her role and the role sent to her by relevant others. Second, the taking of additional roles may create role overload. Here, the roles are not necessarily incompatible but it is difficult to allocate sufficient time and energy to all of the multiple roles.

Hall (1972) examined these conflicts among working women and focused on the methods women used to cope with the added stress. Women used primarily three coping strategies. These involved (1) changing the demands of a role which was termed structural role redefinition, (2) setting priorities on meeting role demands and otherwise learning to live with the added conflict which was termed personal role redefinition, and (3) attempting to meet the demands of all the multiple roles which was termed reactive role behavior. In general, structural role redefinition was positively related to satisfaction while reactive role behavior was negatively related to satisfaction. The results were complicated, however, by other variables such as full versus part-time employment. As stated by McGrath (1976) such coping strategies will only be successful if they are directed toward the source of the conflict. Similarly, Hall (1972) found that structural role definition would be the best strategy in the long run.

Now some may argue that men also have multiple roles of husband and father in addition to their career. Yet family responsibilities have primarily been assigned to women with the husband's career taking priority. It would be valuable to determine if husbands who share equally in family duties experience

additional role conflict as a result of this new role, and the strategies they use to cope with such demands.

Another area for research concerns the personal role conflict that may be experienced by single women who have already established a career and now desire to marry and/or have children. These women have been able to devote their energies to their career. However, if they believe that wife and mother are also desirable roles, but do not want to chance sacrificing their job, they may experience resentment. A similar argument can be made for wives and mothers who now want a career but feel trapped in their present role.

To summarize this section, women are indeed as capable as men of possessing a person system that matches the requirements of a management career. However, those same women may experience stress as a result of multiple role conflict and person role conflict. Future research needs to examine how to effectively cope with these additional conflicts, and whether stress will be experienced by men who take on additional family responsibilities, by career women who desire marriage and a family, and by married women who desire a career.

The final source of influence on the socialization and development of women into management involves the social-interpersonal environment. It was stated earlier that members of this system communicate expectations to the woman manager concerning appropriate behaviors, work patterns, and performance levels. Further, her behavior and performance are monitored and evaluated according to these sent expectations. To the extent that women in management positions are sent different expectations than men and/or their behavior and performance are evaluated differently, they will encounter different socialization and development.

The literature in this area will be divided into two broad sections. The

first will address the evaluation of women's behavior and performance by relevant others in her role set; the second will address employee reactions to women in supervisory positions. A final section will attempt to integrate the results from these studies.

A common theme in the literature centers on the lack of congruency between the woman's traditional sex-role and her behavior and performance in non-traditional masculine sex-typed jobs. Research suggests that compared to men women are promoted slower, denied opportunities for challenging job duties, and paid lower salaries (cf., Rosen & Jerdee, 1973, 1974; Terborg & Ilgen, 1975). Of interest, out of role behavior also results in a negative evaluation when displayed by men. Rosen and Jerdee (1974) found that a request for time off due to family problems was judged less acceptable when coming from a man than a woman.

The overall results, however, are inconsistent. Hagan and Kahn (1975) found that competent women were evaluated negatively only in conditions of competition. Under conditions of observation and ccoperation, raters positively evaluated a competent woman's performance. Similarly, Bigoness (1976) reported that on a masculine task, given low levels of objective performance women and men were rated equally low; however, given high levels of objective performance women were rated superior to equally performing men. Finally, Epstein (1970) found that career women received more praise than men for lower performance.

The findings of Hagan and Kahn and Epstein could be explained by the role congruency notion if one assumes that not being competitive and the display of low performance are consistent with woman's traditional role. However, the findings of Bigoness suggest that some other process may be operating. Superior performance when unexpected may result in a more positive evaluation

than superior performance when expected (Leventhal & Michaels, 1971; Weiner, 1972). If women are not expected to perform well, and research suggests that men see women managers as operating under constraints beyond their control (Terborg & Ilgen, 1975), then when they do perform well, their performance may be attributed to extra effort, and so forth. Thus, they are perceived as more worthy of a reward.

Women appear then to be in the unenviable position of sometimes being rewarded for high performance which is not expected and sometimes being rewarded for low performance which is expected. If the latter occurs, women may quickly learn to restrict their performance to "acceptable" levels. Given this restricted performance, it becomes easy to explain why women are not promoted as quickly as men, given challenging job assignments, etc. A strong warning needs to accompany these results, however. Most of these findings are based on laboratory studies and as with much of the work in this area, the external validity needs to be determined.

As a final comment, Rosen and Jerdee (1975) found that a similar phenomenon occurs with regard to behaviors in addition to performance. Women using a threatening approach when presenting a grievance were perceived as behaving out of role and because of this their complaint was judged to be more serious than a similar threat by a man.

The congruency idea has also been used to explain employee reactions to women in supervisory positions. In a laboratory study, Jacobson and Effertz (1974) found support for their hypotheses that followers would be more critical of male leaders than female leaders since more was expected of the males in this leadership position, and leaders would be more critical of female followers than male followers since more was expected of the females in this follower

position. Bartol (1974), however, found results not predicted by sex-role congruency. In a detailed experiment which used an eight week long management game as a task, subordinate satisfaction was not effected by the female leader's need for dominance. Rather, need for dominance was positively related with subordinate satisfaction for both male and female leaders.

Employee satisfaction with leader behavior also was examined in two field studies. Hansen (1974) found that although there were no sex of supervisor differences on ratings of support behaviors and goal facilitation behaviors, subordinates of both sexes were less satisfied if their supervisor was female. Correlations between leader behavior and subordinate satisfaction were generally lower for the female supervisor group and there was some indication that this was due to the low satisfaction reported by female subordinates working for female supervisors. Finally, Hansen found that a subset of women supervisors reported having less job autonomy than men. If subordinates also perceived this, then this could explain the lower correlations. Petty and Lee (1975) conducted a similar study with dissimilar results. Ratings of leader consideration were more highly correlated with subordinate satisfaction when the supervisor was female. There also was a negative correlation between initiation of structure and subordinate satisfaction for a subset of males under a female supervisor. These results were interpreted as supporting the sex-role congruency notion since the display of consideration behaviors is consistent with the feminine stereotype while the display of initiation of structure behaviors is not.

The effects of sex of department head on subordinate ratings of organizational climate were investigated by Roussell (1974). Even though there were no sex differences on ratings of power, aggressiveness, suggestibility, and professional knowledge, the climate profiles showed that departments

headed by males were rated high on the dimensions of "esprit" and "intimacy" while departments headed by females were rated high on the dimension of "hinderance." Consistent with the findings of Hansen (1974), correlations between leader behavior and subordinate ratings of climate were generally lower for the female department head group.

In explaining their results, many of the above discussed authors have limited their arguments to one of two overlapping positions. First, sex-role stereotypes concerning appropriate behavior exist and second, actuarial prejudice makes successful performance by a female unexpected and therefore noteworthy. It would now be valuable to consider other more complicated processes which could help explain this differential reaction to women in management positions. If stereotypes are as pervasive as some assume, then why are the results in this area so inconsistent?

One explanation which merits further research is what Staines, Tavris, and Jayaratne (1973) call the "Queen Bee Syndrome." The queen bee is a woman who has attained success and status in a man's world and views other women as competitors for her position. If women managers do display different behaviors toward female subordinates than male subordinates, then findings of low satisfaction among female subordinates of female supervisors could be explained. Although past studies show no behavioral differences across sex of supervisor, respondents frequently are asked to rate their supervisor "on the average." This method would not uncover differential behavior directed toward individual subordinates. Use of the methodology employed by Graen (1976) in his vertical-dyad-linkage model of leader behavior would be better able to determine whether the queen bee syndrome is a viable explanation.

Another consideration deals with the upward influence women supervisors have in making resources available to their work unit. Research shows that

women managers are often found in dead end jobs (Day & Stogdill, 1972), low status jobs (Goetz & Herman, 1976), and other positions outside of the career path (Lyle & Ross, 1973). If Hansen's finding that women managers have less autonomy is replicated, then the dissatisfaction and resistance toward women managers by their subordinates may not be due to the sex or behavior of the manager. Rather, the woman due to her present low status position is unable to wield influence. If this is correct, then we would expect to find similar subordinate reactions to male managers who also lack upward influence. Work by Pelz (1952) and more recently by Graen and his associates (Cashman, Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1976; Graen, Cashman, Ginsburgh, & Schiemen, in press) provides strong support for the influence explanation. Pursuing this further, it should not be assumed that women are placed in these low status positions solely on the basis of stereotypes held by men. Women for various reasons may not commit themselves to a career as early as men, they may be unaware of the techniques of job switching due to lack of role models, or they may be unwilling to relocate in order to progress up the career ladder.

The existence of inconsistent results should also be examined with regard to possible confusion among the woman's role set. At the beginning of this section it was stated that members of the social-interpersonal environment possess and communicate expectations concerning appropriate actions, qualities, and performance levels which are associated with a position or job. Since these expectations deal with a position and not with individual members who occupy that position, then sex of role incumbent should not drastically influence this role-taking/role-making process. Similarly, the display of identical behaviors and performance levels should result in identical evaluations of that role incumbent. However, as evident from the proliferation of inconsistent results, the process is much more complex.

Perhaps, due to the high visibility of the woman, her role set includes a different membership than that of a man. Second, while the sent role for male incumbents may be expected to vary as a function of position; when considering a female incumbent, the sent role may vary as a function of sex, position, and a sex by position interaction. Thus, in those instances where sex-role stereotypes are operative, a woman may be evaluated along the dimensions of sex and position while a man is evaluated according to position. Consequently, a woman's behavior and/or performance can be out of role by sex while in role by position, in role by sex and out of role by position, out of role by sex and position, and in role by sex and position. Of course, the same argument can be made for men in feminine sex-typed jobs but our concern here is with women in management.

A further complication arises when we distinguish behavior from performance. Successful performance by a woman may be unexpected and for that reason she is evaluated positively. However, the behaviors engaged in by that woman in order to be successful may be discrepant from accepted sex-roles and in this instance she may be evaluated negatively.

What then can be done in order to break out of this cycle? A solution may be found if we reconsider the three major sources of influence which interact to shape a woman manager's socialization and development. Taking the person system first, we know that increasing numbers of women are choosing careers in business and are taking steps toward acquiring the necessary skills and experience. Examination of the technological environment also is encouraging. Techniques are available for the selection and placement of women into jobs for which they have a reasonable probability of success. The major barrier then appears to be in providing on-the-job opportunities for

development and demonstration of success. This brings role-taking and role-making within the interpersonal environment to the forefront. Just as members of this system influence the woman role incumbent, she also can influence the expectations, etc., held by these members of her role set. To the extent that women engage in the appropriate behaviors for that position and demonstrate the ability to be successful, they will exert pressure on the role set to evaluate them on an individual basis rather than as an undifferentiated member of a subgroup. However, if a woman is promoted into a position solely because of her sex, and she does not possess the skill, experience, and self-concept needed for that position, then she will most likely fail just as a similar man would fail. This failure would perpetuate the belief that women do not belong in positions of responsibility and authority. On the other hand, given a performance record of success, over time the expectations of the role set should shift away from a sex-role orientation and more toward a position-role orientation. In the past, this change has probably occurred due to the over powering qualifications of the woman. Evidence exists which shows that women in management have greater qualifications than men in similar positions (Day & Stogdill, 1972; Roussell, 1975).

This process can, however, be speeded up. Berlew and Hall (1966), Graen (1976), Hall (1971), and Livingston (1969) all point toward the crucial role of the person's first supervisor. The experiences encountered during the first year are strongly related to later success and career development. If women are placed in a protege-mentor relationship with supervisors who have records of developing their subordinates, then the initial resistance to women by members of her role set should be broken down more rapidly. However, if women are denied this early support and opportunity vis-a-vis lack of

role models or placement into dead-end jobs which have little power, then only the over-qualified will survive. O'Leary (1974) stated that more research needs to be directed toward the impact of such role models. This research has not been forthcoming. Yet this role making and role modeling may provide the major step toward the successful integration of women in management.

Conclusions

Throughout this paper various research needs have been stated. I would like to take this opportunity to make a few more comments in this area. First, there must be more longitudinal field research which considers the interchange between the person system, the technological environment, and the interpersonal environment. Behavior in organizations with its interlocking roles, environmental constraints, and long term consequences is vastly different from one shot laboratory studies with paper and pencil stimulus persons and lack of reciprocity. Second, more attention should be placed on the consequences of women in management outside of her own work behavior. Men will be faced with a re-evaluation of their own socialized role of "family provider." Conflicts from dual career families will most certainly arise. We know very little about these conflicts or how to cope with them (Hall, 1976).

I am optimistic about the increasing opportunities for women to successfully pursue a career in management. Once women consistently demonstrate success in handling the demands of the position, gender will become unimportant. Rather, my concern for the future lies in the consequences of job equality.

References

Ajzen, I. & Fishbein, M. Attitudinal and normative variables as predictors of specific behaviors. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 27, 41-57.

Alderfer, C.P. Effect of individual, group, and intergroup relations on attitudes toward management development program. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1971, 55, 302-311.

Almquist, E.M. Sex stereotypes in occupational choice: the case for college women. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1974, 5, 13-21.

Bartol, K.M. Male versus female leaders: The effect of leader need for dominance on follower satisfaction. Academy of Management Journal, 1974, 17, 225-233.

Bartol, K.M. Relationship of sex and professional training area to job orientation. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1976, 61, 368-370.

Berlew, D.E. & Hall, D.T. The socialization of managers: effects of expectations on performance. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1966, 11, 207-224.

Bigoness, W.J. Effect of applicant's sex, race, and performance on employer's performance ratings: Some additional findings. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1976, 61, 80-84.

Bowman, G.W., Worthy, N.B., & Greyson, S.A. Problems in review: Are women executives people? Harvard Business Review, 1965, 43, 52-67.

Brigham, J.C. Ethnic stereotypes. Psychological Bulletin, 1971, 76, 15-38.

Cashman, J., Dansereau, F., Graen, G., & Haga, W.J. Organizational understructure and leadership: A longitudinal investigation of the managerial role-making process. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1976, 15, 278-296.

Cecil, E.A., Paul, R.J., & Olins, R.A. Perceived importance of selected variables used to evaluate male and female job applicants. Personnel Psychology, 1973, 26, 397-404.

Cohen, S.L., & Bunker, K.A. Subtle effects of sex role stereotypes on recruiter's hiring decisions. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1975, 60 566-572.

Lansereau, F. Cashman, J., & Graen, G. Instrumentality theory and equity theory as complementary approaches in predicting the relationship of leadership and turnover among managers. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance

Day, D.R. & Stogdill, R.M. Leader behavior of male and female supervisors: A comparative study. Personnel Psychology, 1972, 25, 353-360.

Dipboye, R.L., Fromkin, H.L., & Wiback, K. Relative importance of applicant sex, attractiveness, and scholastic standing in evaluation of job applicant resumes. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1975, 60, 39-43.

East, C. The current status of the employment of women. In M.E. Katzell & W.C. Byham (Eds.), Women in the work force: Confrontation with change. New York: Behavioral Publications, 1972.

Epstein, C.F. Woman's place. Berkely: University of California Press, 1970.

Feldman, J.M. & Hilterman, R.J. Stereotype attribution revisited: The role of stimulus characteristics, racial attitude, and cognitive differentiation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, 1177-1188.

Goetz, T.E. & Herman, J.B. Effects of supervisor's sex and subordinate sex on job satisfaction and productivity. Paper presented at the 84th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C., September, 1976.

Gordon, F.E. & Hall, D.T. Self-image and stereotypes of femininity: Their relationship to women's role conflicts and coping. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1974, 59, 241-243.

Gordon, F.E. & Strober, M.H. Bringing women into management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Graen, G. Role-making processes within complex organizations. In M.D. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976.

Graen, G., Cashman, J., Ginsburgh, S., & Schiemann, W. Effects of linking-pin quality upon the quality of working life of lower participants: A longitudinal investigation of the managerial understructure. Administrative Science Quarterly, in press.

Hagen, R.L. & Kahn, A. Discrimination against competent women. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 1975, 5, 362-376.

Hall, D.T. A theoretical model of career subidentity development in organizational settings. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1971, 6, 50-76.

Hall, D.T. A model of coping with role conflict: The role behavior of college educated women. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1972, 17, 471-486.

Hall, D.T. Careers in organizations. Pacific Palisades, Calif: Goodyear Publishing Company.

Hall, D.T. & Gordon, F.E. Career choices of married women: Effects on conflict, role behavior, and satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1973, 58, 42-48.

Hansen, P. Sex differences and supervision. Paper presented at the 82nd Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, New Orleans, September, 1974.

Hawley, P. What women think men think. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1971, 3, 193-199.

Huck, J.R. & Bray, D.W. Management assessment center evaluations and subsequent job performance of white and black females. Personnel Psychology, 1976, 29, 13-30.

Jacklin, C.N. & Maccoby, E.E. Sex differences and their implications for management. In Gordon, F.E. & Strober, E.E. (Eds.), Bringing women into management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Jacobson, M.B. & Effertz, J. Sex roles and leadership: Perceptions of the leaders and the led. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1974, 12, 383-396.

Korman, A.K. Toward a hypothesis of work behavior. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1970, 54, 31-41.

Lawler, E.E. Pay and organizational effectiveness: A psychological view. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Lawler, E.E., Kuleck, W.J., Rhode, J.G., & Sorensen, J.E. Job choice and post decision dissonance. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1975, 13, 133-145.

Leventhal, G.S. & Michaels, J.W. Locus of cause and equity motivations as determinants of reward allocation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1971, 17, 229-235.

Livingston, J.S. Pygmalion in management. Harvard Business Review, 1969, 47, 81-89.

Lyle, J.R. & Ross, J.L. Women in industry. Lexington, Mass.: Heath, 1973.

Mathews, J.J., Collins, W.E., & Cobb, B.B. A sex comparison of reasons for attrition in a male dominated occupation. Personnel Psychology, 1974, 27, 535-541.

McClelland, D.C. Toward a theory of motive acquisition. American Psychologist, 1965, 20, 321-333.

McGrath, J.E. Stress and behavior in organizations. In M.D. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology. Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1976.

Miner, J.B. Studies in management education. New York: Springer, 1965.

Miner, J.B. Motivation to manage among women: Studies of business managers and educational administrators. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1974, 5, 197-208.

Morrison, R.F. & Sebald, M. Personal characteristics differentiating female executives from female nonexecutive personnel. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1974, 59, 656-659.

Moses, J.L. & Boehm, V.R. Relationship of assessment center performance to management progress of women. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1975, 60, 527-529.

Nevo, B. Using biographical information to predict success of men and women in the Army. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1976, 61, 106-108.

O'Leary, V.E. Some attitudinal barriers to occupational aspirations in women. Psychological Bulletin, 1974, 81, 809-826.

Pelz, D.C. Influence: A key to effective leadership in the first-line supervisor. Personnel, 1952, 9, 3-11.

Petty, M.M. & Lee, G.K. Moderating effects of sex of supervisor and subordinate on relationships between supervisor behavior and subordinate satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1975, 60, 624-628.

Rosen, B. & Jerdee, T.H. The influence of sex-role stereotypes on evaluations of male and female supervisory behavior. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1973, 57, 44-48.

Rosen, B. & Jerdee, T.H. Influence of sex role stereotypes on personnel decisions. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1974, 59, 9-14.

Rosen, B. & Jerdee, T.H. Effects of applicant's sex and difficulty of job on evaluations of candidates for managerial positions. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1974, 59, 511-512.

Rosen, B. & Jerdee, T.H. Effects of employee's sex and threatening versus pleading appeals on managerial evaluations of grievances. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1975, 60, 442-445.

Rosen, B. & Jerdee, T.H. The psychological basis for sex role stereotypes: A note on Terborg and Ilgen's conclusions. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1975, 14, 151-153.

Rousseil, C. Relationship of sex of department head to department climate. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1974, 19, 211-220.

Schein, V.E. The woman industrial psychologist: Illusion or reality? American Psychologist, 1971, 26, 708-712.

Schein, V.E. The relationship between sex role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1973, 57, 95-100.

Schein, V.E. Relationships between sex role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics among female managers. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1975, 60, 340-344.

Staines, G., Tavris, C., & Jayaratne, T.E. The queen bee syndrome. In C. Tavris (Ed.), The female experience. Del Mar, Calif: CRM, Inc., 1973.

Super, D.E. A theory of vocational development. American Psychologist, 1953, 8, 185-190.

Terborg, J.R. & Ilgen, D.R. A theoretical approach to sex discrimination in traditionally masculine occupations. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1975, 13, 352-376.

Terborg, J.R., Peters, L.H., Ilgen, D.R., & Smith, F. Organizational and personal correlates of attitudes toward women as managers. Academy of Management Journal, in press.

Touhey, J.C. Effects of additional women professionals ratings of occupational prestige and desirability. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1974, 29, 86-89.

Touhey, J.C. Effects of additional men on prestige and desirability of occupations typically performed by women. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 1974, 4, 330-335.

Treiman, D.J. & Terrell, K. Sex and the process of status attainment: A comparison of working women and men. American Sociological Review, 1975, 40, 174-200.

Vogel, S.R., Broverman, I.K., Broverman, D.M., Clarkson, F.E., & Rosenkrantz, P.S. Maternal employment and perception of sex roles among college students. Developmental Psychology, 1970, 3, 381-384.

Weiner, B. From each according to his abilities: The role of effort in a moral society. Paper presented at the 80th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Honolulu, Hawaii, September, 1972.

Weisman, C.S., Morlock, L.L., Sack, D.G., & Levine, D.M. Sex differences in response to a blocked career pathway among unaccepted medical school applicants. Sociology of Work and Occupations, 1976, 3, 187-208.